

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, and 26-44 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Arlein. In response, base claims 1 and 33 have been amended. Claims 28-30, 32, 40-42 and 44 have also been amended to properly reference the amended base claims. Claim 45 has been added, which is dependent on claim 1 and drawn to a further aspect of the invention.

The invention is directed to a technique for communication of information to a mobile device. In accordance with the invention, profiles of a mobile device user are established, reflecting different personae of the user, e.g., a personal profile, business profile, vacation profile, etc. A user may utilize the device to send a request for information, which may include data indicative of a selected persona of the user and a location of the device determined by the device (e.g., GPS data). Based on the received data, a server collects the requested information from different sources, e.g., Internet sources. The requested information is then provided to the device, which includes information concerning at least one resource (e.g., a restaurant) in accordance with the profile associated with the selected persona. The resource is selected as a function of at least of the location of the device. *See* page 9, line 21 *et seq.*; page 14, line 11 *et seq.* of the specification; and Figs. 4, 5 and 10.

Arlein discloses a technique for providing a user web-browsing experience at a merchant's website based on a persona selected by a user. However, nowhere does Arlein teach or suggest receipt of a user request, and "data indicative of a location of the [user] communication device determined by the communication device," as amended claims 1 and 33 now recite. *A fortiori*, nowhere does Arlein teach or suggest selection of a resource in response to the user request "as a function of at least the location of the communication device," as amended claims 1 and 33 further recite. As such, the claimed invention is not anticipated by Arlein. Nor is it obvious from reading Arlein. Thus, amended claims 1 and 33, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over Arlein.


In the Office Action, the Examiner made of record Patent No. 6,829,532 ("the '532 patent") issued to Obradovich et al. as prior art. Although the Examiner did not rely upon the '532 patent to reject the claims, applicants respectfully request that the '532 patent be removed

**Appln No. 09/910,510**  
**Amdt date April 24, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of January 23, 2006**

from the record as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 because the inventorship of the '532 patent is common to that of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-5 and 26-44, as amended, and claim 45, as added, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Daniel M. Cavanagh  
Reg. No. 41,661  
626/795-9900

DMC/rmw

RMW IRV1094697.1-\* -04/24/06 1:49 PM